

# ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

Published Semi-Monthly by

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, Inc.

350 Fifth Ave., New York 1, N. Y.

903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.

600 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.

1559 Continental Illinois Bank Bldg., Chicago 4, Ill.

Council Letter No. 152

October 1, 1946

## As We Disintegrate

THINGS are happening so fast it is difficult to tell at any given moment just where we Americans stand in the world.

This Letter aims to place before you, as it were, a snapshot of some conditions today. It may serve to stimulate your thinking on present day events and what they add up to.

Foremost in our minds are (1) the foreign situation, highlighted by Mr. Wallace's speech before two communistic organizations at Madison Square Garden, September 12th; and, (2) the recent strikes, notably those of the seamen on all our coasts in our Merchant Marine and Dan Tobin's truckmen in New York City.

In Letter 150, we stated the policy-making body of the Democratic Party is the PAC, but that the Republican Party has neither a policy-making body nor a policy. With respect to the Democratic Party's policy, this should be modified to note that Secretary Byrnes has been getting definitely back toward a pro-American policy.

We have criticized Mr. Byrnes freely—for instance, for his part in the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, in which just about every promise of the Atlantic Charter with respect to the rights of nations to choose their own form of government, was thrown out the window. We took exception to his joining with Britain and France early last March in calling for the overthrow of the Franco government in Spain—which, of course, was just one more abandonment of the Atlantic Charter.

But this uncalled for and mischievous utterance on Spain, was the high-water mark of the reckless un-American policy of the Administration. For, ten days later, Mr. Byrnes was clambering up on solid ground with the assertion that it was no business of the United States what form of government Spain wanted or what leader it chose to have. Since then, there seems to have been in the State Department a growing realization that American policy applied to Spain had been both unrealistic and un-American.

So great is the power of propaganda and so active had been the emissaries and zealots of Soviet Russia, that our foreign policy, under both Roosevelt and Truman, had seemed to be based first of all on a desire to repudiate the principle of "America first." That principle, of course, is comparable with the analogous principle of every other sane and sensible nation, and always will

be. For, obviously, we expect Mr. Churchill or any other Briton to be for Britain first; Mr. Stalin to be—as he always has been—for Russia first; General de Gaulle for France first, and so on. When these nations cease to be for their respective selves first, then we may reasonably expect mosquitoes at Christmas and holly in June.

So, the mid-March State Department utterance on Spain marked a veering back toward sanity. And this trend has continued. We are as ready to praise Secretary Byrnes for this as we were to criticize him when we disagreed.

Mr. Byrnes' change of policy reached a high point in his Stuttgart speech of August 6th. Apparently tired of the incessant disposition of Soviet Russia's representatives to stir up trouble wherever possible, Mr. Byrnes launched out into definite and positive assurances—assurances that brought new hope and renewed faith to every American who believes in America.

Mr. Byrnes was particularly effective in urging the reuniting of Germany, economically and politically. American policy toward Germany has heretofore had some ghastly mistakes. We predicted three years ago that the principle of "unconditional surrender" would drive what remained undestroyed in Germany straight into the arms of Moscow—which is precisely what has taken place. Men of whatever country will not live indefinitely with despair—not if there is a way out—even a Communist way. Indeed it is likely that America's ruthless policy toward the Germans was cunningly prompted by Leftists for the very purpose of reducing the Germans to despair, thus preparing them to yield to Communist propaganda.

Some of the bombing of Germany—Dresden, for instance, a city with no military aspect—will always remain a blot on America. Human experience shows that when one nation has defeated another in war, and the defeat is admitted, it pays to begin immediately to prepare for a happier future. The road to peace is not through vengeance—after 2,000 years we Christians know that. Peace is built on generous deeds—not on retribution.

Within a few years after the Boer War, Britain, following the Christian policy, succeeded in binding South Africa firmly to herself; and now for many years past, Jan Smutz, who as a Boer military leader gave the British Army many a headache shortly after the turn of the century, has



been a loyal statesman of the British Empire.

But American policy persisted in its demand for "unconditional surrender." It went through to the bitter end.

And then we adopted the "Morgenthau plan"—the plan to reduce the Germans, one of the great industrial peoples of the world, to a pastoral level.

Forgetting our own national interests, which include the fact that Germany had always been a good customer of ours (as she had been of Britain's), we Americans permitted ourselves to be led by a policy of Old Testament vindictiveness. The Psalmist said of the Babylon captivity:

"Remember, O Lord, the children of Edom in the day of Jerusalem; who said, Rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof.

"O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be, that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us.

"Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones."

Then, the policy of vindictiveness well under way, we have been led by the same influence into the so-called war criminal trials—only just concluded after many months. We permitted a Justice of the Supreme Court, to the great inconvenience of the Court and the lowering of its dignity in the eyes of the American people, to leave his Bench and become the chief prosecutor. Was it because this Justice believed that his political ambitions would be served by his thus serving those who demand an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, that he was willing to inject into vengeful politics the Supreme Court of the United States?

We have no apology to offer for any of these persons who are being tried. If any of them has been guilty of what by some actual law was criminal when committed, let him be punished. But many able lawyers, historians and fair-minded people generally in the United States and Britain, not as humanitarians, but as believers in "Equal Justice Under Law," have repeatedly condemned these trials. There is no warrant under the Constitution of the United States (the only instrument that can possibly govern Americans) for such action. One of the objectives of our ancestors in fleeing Europe was to get away from *ex-post facto* laws—laws that make criminal an act which was not criminal when committed. And here now, in 1946, America, in the shape of Justice Jackson, has gone back to Europe to re-enact *ex-post facto* laws—all to please the vindictive element in our midst.

By our participation in these trials, for which the only modern precedent is the liquidation trials of Soviet Russia, we have established a precedent that may return to plague us. For should we ever lose a war, these trials will be cited as our enemies proceed to the criminal trials of the President of the United States, all his Cabinet, leading officers of the Army, Navy and Air Corps, and any industrialists, labor leaders, churchmen, and other citizens who may have aroused the ill-will of any influential group among our conquerors.

These trials, and the feverish but ineffective attempts to maintain interest in them, are themselves the product of Leftist propaganda. Reams of

stuff in popular style have been printed by or at the instance of our Vindictive Few—a recent example of which is an article entitled "Last Mile," by Frederic Ullman, Jr., in the Sunday magazine supplement, *This Week* for September 15, 1946. Out of these trials, writes Mr. Ullman, "will come a whole new body of laws equalled in importance only by the creation of the Common Law."

We would do well to remember something else. There is every evidence that the present Soviet government plans to reduce the United States of America to subjection to it. Before we "liquidate" all these Germans, in true Asiatic style, had we not better look them over carefully to see if some of them would not be useful in the defense of America?

Mr. Byrnes' Stuttgart speech was a refreshing turn of events. After wasting a year and a half, during which the world's common enemy, Soviet Russia, made far-reaching and startling gains, we have finally awakened to the fact it may be a good thing to let Germany live.

\* \* \* \* \*

Then came Henry Wallace's September 12th speech. Speaking for the communistic forces in the United States, he undertook to undo just about all that Byrnes had done. The President said first he had read Wallace's speech and approved it. His later statement that America's policy toward Stalin was unchanged by Wallace's speech only partially remedied the situation. Mr. Wallace's resignation September 20th, at Mr. Truman's request, was the only outcome that could adequately tell the American people, and the world, that Mr. Byrnes' policy was to stand.

Never, from the standpoint of America's vital interests, has a President been more inept. Never has Soviet influence in official Washington dared go so far.

\* \* \* \* \*

What influences in America gave Wallace the strength and will to lead an un-American movement—right in the Cabinet itself?

First of all are the utterly one-sided labor laws and those labor leaders who are disposed to take advantage of them.

Rose Wilder Lane reviews in the October Book Review Mr. John W. Scoville's "Labor Monopolies—OR Freedom," the best presentation to date of the extent to which American workers and the American people generally have been turned over to the control of an alien-minded group.

In no field had Americans made a greater success of their Republic than in production and distribution of goods and services. The American standard of living was built up largely under the Open Shop. It was not until 1933 that certain politicians seized upon the idea of herding all workers (Wallace and his friends insist upon calling them Common Men) into organizations completely controlled by a few. About the same time the Congress was persuaded to pass laws exempting these labor leaders from injunction and from the laws relating to conspiracy and restraint of trade.

Under the license thus given to a handful of men, some of them aliens, some of them ex-crimi-



nals, things have developed to a point where these leaders are above and outside the law. They are licensed to prey on the whole American people, and many of them are exercising that license to the full.

Almost any taxi driver in New York will tell you it is useless to complain to the police against the CIO bus drivers because the Transport Workers Union, headed by Michael Quill, is stronger than the city government. Quill denies he is a Communist, but he consistently plays the Communists' game. The traveling public is subjected to inconvenience and insult. Hardly a newspaper in all New York is willing to editorialize against this outrage.

As we write, the shipping of the country on all oceans is tied up by strikes under the communistic Joseph Curran in the Atlantic and Harry Bridges in the Pacific.

As long as we tolerate the Wagner Act and other laws, under which we license ruthless men to toss about at will the welfare of the American people, these conditions will continue and grow worse. Should war with Soviet Russia develop, (and Russia is the only country that conceivably would make war on us) the control exercised by these "labor leaders" is set to produce civil war at home. The havoc they could create at home would throw into grave doubt the outcome of the foreign war. That is precisely what the inspirers of these laws intend.

Indeed, piecing together utterances of Stalin and other Communists, in Russia and in the United States, we see that these strikes are mere dress-rehearsals for Communist-inspired revolution right here in the United States—a revolution exactly timed to fit war made on us by Russia abroad. This revolution might come now at any time. If it were met with the amiable weakness of Mr. Truman or of impractical visionaries like Wallace, there would be frightful bloodshed among our citizens before the country rose and wreaked its vengeance upon the revolutionaries.

For Communist-influenced unions now control our shipping on all seas, thus being in position to refuse to transport American troops. They control much of our communication, including radio; much of our transportation, including New York City subways, buses and elevators in buildings. A few thousand determined agents of Stalin (and every Communist is such an agent) could seize almost any city in America, including New York. They could reduce it to starvation, meanwhile "liquidating" any part of the population they pleased. To do this would of course require a high degree of coordination. But Communists are masters of that. A general strike in key industries would shut down all citizen activity. Entrance or exit to Manhattan would be stopped by closing and guarding all tunnels and bridges. Every armory would be seized at the same instant, by whatever force necessary, and thus all stores of arms would fall into Communist hands.

This would (we nearly said, will) take place not only in New York but other cities. An attempt might or might not be made to seize Washington. Of course, the country would rise with the greatest cry of anger America ever heard. But the mis-

chief would be done. Along with the seizure of cities would come similar seizure of vital plants, mines, etc.; or, if not seizure, then certain sabotage. Pearl Harbor would be trivial in its possible effect, compared with what America's Communists could and would not hesitate to do. The war of Russia on the United States *could* be lost in the first twenty-four hours.

For, through the acts and omissions of our visionless politicians, we have a viper in our bosom. We have laws which have in effect licensed enemies of our country to do precisely what we have described. They plan our destruction. They are determined men. And if we Americans do not awake in time, their plan will go through.

Recently a leading New York paper, bound in the traditions of the past, while always prattling of "Liberalism" and internationalism, remarked that no one could account for the recent drop in the Stock Market. Does the fact that Communist seizure of the United States could reduce to zero the value of every stock and bond on the Exchange—does this possibly offer a clue?

**BUT ALL THESE DREAD THINGS NEED NOT HAPPEN—if only we awake.** We must remove the causes that would make it possible. We must repeal the labor laws that have licensed these enemies to destroy us. We must repeal them, and make ourselves again a *free* people, before they do destroy us.

\* \* \* \* \*

As we contemplate these crises in our foreign and domestic affairs, let us note some other things that are transpiring.

The Leftists have long worked in education and this work is today more intense than ever. At one of the 1946 summer sessions at a certain Eastern Teachers' College, special emphasis was laid on the pragmatic doctrine—that there is no ulterior end toward which to work; *that the important thing is to be ready for change.* To instill this in the minds of teachers in order that they may instill it into the minds of pupils produces a situation made to order for the Communists.

In a recent *New York Times* forum, a representative of the faculty of a New York high school is reported to have objected to the teaching of religion to younger children on the ground that it stifled thought if given them before they were old enough to understand it. This is similar to the idea that children must not be restrained lest their individuality be checked. Out of this notion has come the modern revolt of youth against receiving anything that is traditional. The result in both school and college has been the undermining of standards and morals. Already the effects are seen in widespread refusal to submit to authority. This prepares recruits for lawless picket lines and the breakdown of local government visible in many strikes. So is paved the path for Communism.

\* \* \* \* \*

The *New York Times* of September 13 reported that American carloadings, for the last week of August, 1946, were higher than in any August week in the last four years. Yet, try to buy an automobile, radio or electric refrigerator. Try to rent or buy a house or apartment, or to build any kind of a structure. Try to buy a white



shirt or a clothes pin. All of these—and many more—are almost impossible to find.

Where is all the stuff in the carloadings going? Some agencies of government seem to have the power practically to strip bare the American market—over and above that minimum that certain Washington bureaucrats feel is good for us Americans to have.

We continue to ship huge quantities of material, much of it available for war, to Soviet Russia and her satellite countries. So great was the indignation of American longshoremen that they recently refused to load ships for Yugoslavia. These men shared the thought, almost universally held in the United States, that when a country, on which we had showered American arms, equipment and food, deliberately murders our airmen, it is the veriest folly to continue to ship her goods—especially when Americans often cannot buy the same goods in the United States.

Who is deciding that this stuff is to be shipped? The President, of course, in the last analysis. But the President can give only limited attention to many things. Unquestionably the decision is reached by Leftists in the Administration, who quietly order these things done. And to hell with the interests of the American people!

\* \* \* \* \*

Communism and its influences continue to work even in the churches. Every large Protestant denomination has its Leftist group, formed to inculcate Leftist ideas. These groups urge that we "understand Russia." God knows, by the murdering of our airmen by Yugoslavia; by other insults received by us at the hands of Soviet representatives; by the covering of this country with Russian spies, when not a single inquisitive representative of the United States would be tolerated in Soviet Russia; by the continuous obstruction by Soviet representatives in the United Nations: by all these things, we certainly ought to understand Russia by now.

Yet the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church (*New York Herald Tribune* of September 20), in general convention in Philadelphia September 19, adopted a resolution urging that "both nations (the United States and Soviet Russia) must be prepared to make reasonable concessions"—in order to avoid war.

Certainly no one in America wants war. But the Stalin government is bent on war, provided it cannot subjugate the United States through infiltration. We have already made so many concessions to Soviet Russia that we have sacrificed our most vital principles; while Soviet Russia has shown every disposition to take advantage of us.

And how many of the good bishops who voted this resolution know that Bishop Scarlett has a strong Leftist record of his own? For 16 years he has been a member of the National Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union whose Executive Director, Roger Baldwin, said, in an autobiographical sketch in a Harvard Yearbook, that "the goal is Communism." In 1926 Bishop Scarlett (not then a Bishop), back in St. Louis after a month's study of Russian conditions, praised the Soviet Government saying that it was absolutely sound. The Communistic Federated Press

quoted him as saying, "In Russia I found absolute religious freedom, and the churches full." According to the newspapers, Bishop Scarlett in 1937 rejected the suggestion that Protestant churches cooperate in the campaign against Communism initiated by the Pope.

\* \* \* \* \*

The United States is lousy with citizens and groups meddling in fields they do not understand. We pointed this out in Council Letter 151 about the Committee for Economic Development.

Americans have gone throughout the earth sticking their noses into situations, with the best of intentions, but often with little real knowledge of what they were doing.

We built up in America the greatest industrial edifice in history; and now we are permitting irresponsible men to knock it about at their own pleasure.

Many in our Churches have the notion that much of our industry, whose success has itself made possible the building and endowment of these very Churches, is somehow evil. Through the various church organizations, like the Church League for Industrial Democracy, they are doing their bit to tear industry apart.

Throughout the United States, some of the most vital interests of the American people are being toyed with by men lacking appropriate experience—by men who are themselves unaccustomed to shouldering and discharging responsibility.

The leaders of world Communism have long said they were going to destroy capitalism. Some of them having particularly singled out the United States as the greatest exponent of capitalism. Stalin, only a few months ago, said that capitalism and Communism could not survive in the world together. We have not seen all of the evidence in the country, but, from what we have seen, we believe that all of these things are parts of one Plan. That Plan is the projection into the United States of the Communist plan of Soviet Russia.

Abraham Lincoln said:

"When we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen . . . and when we see those timbers joined together, and see that they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, and all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few . . . in such a case we find it impossible not to believe that . . . all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft, drawn up before the first blow was struck."

The "common plan or draft" is to destroy America and all its freedom—to reduce its people to the level of Poland or Czechoslovakia. The plan is far advanced.

*Merwin K. Hart*

President

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC.